

# UNITY

LEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL  
SCHOOL LIBRARY

## CONTENTS

Editorial Comments ..... 3

Honoring the Unorthodox ..... 5

*Ira D. Cardiff*

Principles or Reprisals..... 10

*Edward H. Redman*

If This Be Heresy..... 18

*Max D. Gaebler*

Ethics of Man.....24

*John G. MacKinnon*

The Issues Are Real!..... 25

*Ellsworth M. Smith*

---

MARCH-APRIL, 1961

VOL. CXLVII, No. 1

# U N I T Y

---

*Established 1878*

81835

RANDALL S. HILTON, *Editor*

---

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

IRA D. CARDIFF—"Honoring the Unorthodox"—is the author of *A Million Years of Progress* and has had a distinguished career in research, teaching, writing, and administration. He resides in Yakima, Washington.

MAX D. GAEBLER—"If This Be Heresy"—is Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin, and President of the Unitarian Ministers Association.

JOHN G. MACKINNON—"Ethics of Man"—is Minister of the All Souls Unitarian Church of Indianapolis, Indiana.

EDWARD H. REDMAN—"Principles or Reprisals"—is Minister of the Unitarian Church of Arlington, Virginia.

ELLSWORTH M. SMITH—"The Issues Are Real!"—is Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference and Regional Director for the American Unitarian Association.

---

Published bimonthly except during July and August  
by the

Abraham Lincoln Centre  
700 Oakwood Boulevard  
Chicago 53, Illinois

*Subscription \$2.*

*Single Copies 50 cents.*

---

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."



# Editorial Comments

**W**E listened to a delightfully fascinating talk on the history and development of Humanism by Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, Minister of the Unitarian Church in Geneva, Illinois, and retired Professor of Church History at the Meadville Theological School. For an hour he covered Humanism from Protagoras to John Dietrich with many whimsical asides on Unitarian frailties and incongruities. His major emphasis was that the essence of Humanism is its concern for humanity and humaneness. To the extent that a person is motivated by a genuine concern for man and is humane in his ethical practices, to that extent a person is a Humanist. With this we agree. However, this is not enough to make one a Humanist.

The presence of a concern for humanity and humaneness makes one humanistic but not necessarily a Humanist. For the Humanist there must also be those mental attitudes and concepts which strengthen, justify, and encourage these concerns and practices. No social, political, economic, religious, or philosophical ideology that insists its basic concepts or dogmas are of absolute primary importance can sustain a true Humanism. For the Humanist, such

ideologies must be abandoned or he will be brain-washed by them to the effect that the system becomes paramount, and in a conflict between the system and human welfare humanity loses and any humaneness is purely coincidental.

Thus it is essential to the advancement of Humanism that absolutist ideologies—whether leftist, rightist, or centrist—be exposed. It is equally important that Humanism develop an ideological system that is sufficiently flexible to adjust to the basic concerns for humanity and humaneness.

---

The Philosophical Library published *The Religion of the Occident* by Martin A. Larson. This is a gigantic tome, 733 pages, of extremely fascinating reading. The book is divided into four parts which portray both a logical and chronological development of Christianity.

Part One deals with the pagan origins from the Savior-God Osiris, the Greek Mysteries, Zoroaster, Brahmanism, Buddhism, on through to Mithraism.

Part Two gives the Jewish sources, Judaism and especially the Essenes, including the contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Part Three offers an interpreta-

tion of Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels and in the light of the previously presented materials.

Part Four deals with the Gospel among the pagans and the compromises Christianity has made over the years with the continuing so-called pagan influences.

Here in one volume is an interesting course in comparative religion. It is refreshing in that it, unlike most books on comparative religion, is not an apologia for Christianity. It is an analysis of the various religious concepts that were adapted by or blended into Christianity, the predominant religion of the West.

Dr. Larson (Ph.D., University of Michigan) views the various religions with a modern eye. Far more than traditional religious historians, he emphasizes the social, economic, political, and oftentimes revolutionary aspects of developing religious movements and their founders.

*The Religion of the Occident* is a real contribution to Humanists and all religious liberals. They should read it and have it in their libraries.

---

When a public relief agency is subjected to a thorough investigation and comes out with a comparatively clean bill of health it is news. The newspapers of Chicago

had this kind of news this past winter and the stories ran for a period of about six weeks.

The target of many suspicious taxpayers has been, and in many areas still is, the Aid to Dependent Children program. Charges of fraud, subsidizing illegitimacy, migration of mothers to the city for the purpose of getting on ADC, laziness or refusal to work, hidden fathers, and the like are bandied about without any knowledge of the facts. Irresponsible allegations, such as these, do much to undermine public support for needed and worthwhile public welfare programs.

Two independent surveys of the Cook County Department of Public Welfare, which handles all public assistance in Chicago and Cook County, Illinois, give the lie to the above charges particularly as they relate to ADC. A team of 30 graduate students from Loyola University found that the typical ADC mother is "neither a bad parent nor a depraved individual whose aim in life is to avoid work and take advantage of public assistance." The Greenleigh Associates, a New York management consulting firm, employed by a citizens' committee to study ADC did an even more thorough job. Their findings agreed with those of Loyola and even went further.

(Continued on page 23)



# Honoring the Unorthodox

IRA D. CARDIFF

**H**ERO worship has ever been one of man's virtues — or weaknesses. Whether this human tendency is desirable or not, we love to honor the good and the great, from both the emotional and the educational standpoint. One method of recognition is by a memorial postage stamp, more than a score of which have been issued in the U.S.A. The latest of these from our Postal Department is in honor of Thomas G. Masaryk, first President of Czechoslovakia. Masaryk was an atheist.

When, therefore, this Masaryk stamp first appeared, one of our popular magazines made a discovery—or thought it did—that this was the first time a freethinker was thus honored. Unfortunately the editor's historical knowledge was limited, for the first eighteen men we elected to the Presidency of this "land of freedom" were freethinkers, or at least were not communicants of any orthodox church. Virtually all of these have been honored by use of their portraits on postage stamps.

Lest some gentlemen of the cloth take exception to this assertion, attention may be called to some of the statements these noted personages have made. Starting

with the immortal George Washington, he tells the world that "the government of the United States is in no sense founded upon the Christian religion. The United States is not a Christian nation any more than it is a Jewish or a Mohammedan nation." Washington urged James Madison to draw up the Bill of Rights, amending the Federal Constitution to contain the words "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Our second President, John Adams, is said to have been baptized but apparently it did not "take," for near the end of his long and illustrious life he made the interesting observation that "this would be the best of all possible worlds if there were no religion in it."

Thomas Jefferson, the third President and "father of American democracy," pays his compliments to the popular superstition as follows:

I have recently been examining all the known superstitions of the world, and do not find in our particular superstition (Christianity) one redeeming feature. They are all alike,

founded upon fables and mythologies. The Christian God is a being of terrific character—cruel, vindictive, capricious, and unjust. In every country and in every age the priest has been hostile to liberty.

Jefferson was followed by his celebrated Secretary of State, James Madison, a noted scholar and statesman, who voices his opinion of Christianity thus: "During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of religion been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both superstition, bigotry, and persecution." Madison was strongly opposed to any aid in any form, from State to Church. He said: "Government has no right to dictate creeds, who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christianity in exclusion of all other sects."

Next to occupy the White House was James Monroe. Addressing Congress before he became President, he said: "To the welfare of Thomas Paine the Americans are not, nor can they be, indifferent." President Monroe also warned Congress that "preparation for war is a constant

stimulus to suspicion and ill will." How wonderful it would be today to have such a President.

Our sixth President was John Quincy Adams, another noted scholar, which latter qualification virtually insures his being unorthodox. He classified himself as a Unitarian, as did Fillmore and Taft, all of whom were freethinkers. Many freethinkers and atheists designate themselves Unitarians since the organization carries the cognomen "church" and thus draws less abuse from the orthodox than does the term atheist or free-thinker (also in the mid-twentieth century it is not used as a synonym of Communist). It perhaps should be added that the Unitarian Church is not considered orthodox—by the orthodox.

Andrew Jackson, seventh President, was not a communicant at the time of his election but later joined through the influence of his wife, thus becoming in effect a "son-in-law of the church," of which the nation is blessed with a large number. The doughty Andy, however, did not win great applause from the clergy, for he reminded them that "Thomas Paine needs no monument made by hands, he has erected a monument in the hearts of all lovers of liberty." He likewise displeased the clergy by refusing to proclaim a day of prayer against cholera, stating: "I could not do otherwise



without transcending the limits prescribed by the Constitution for the President; and without feeling that I might in some degree disturb the security which religion nowadays enjoys in this country in its complete separation from the political concerns of the General Government."

Martin Van Buren next occupied the White House, with the following compliment to the conventional cult, "The religious community is a class among us easily instigated to meddle in public affairs and seldom free, on such occasions, from a uniform political bias." John Tyler, tenth President, said: "Let it then be proclaimed to the world . . . that the connection between church and state is an unholy alliance, and the fruitful source of slavery and oppression."

Abraham Lincoln belonged to no church, though numerous cults have claimed him, all of these claims made since his death. He, however, has made some very interesting statements concerning religion, e.g., "What is to be, will be, and no prayers of ours can arrest the decree." "The dogmas of the past are inadequate to the stormy present." "There was the strangest combination of church influence against me. It was concluded that no Christian ought to vote for me, because I belonged to no church." "It will not do to

investigate the subject of religion too closely, as it is apt to lead to infidelity."

Ulysses S. Grant states: "No sectarian tenets should be taught in any school supported by State or National tax," while Benjamin Harrison says: "It does seem to me as if the Christian nations of the world ought to be able to make their contact with the weaker peoples of the earth beneficent and not destructive," and Grover Cleveland states: "I know that human prejudice—especially that growing out of race and religion—is cruelly inveterate and lasting."

Thus all of the Presidents down to and including Grant, except Buchanan and Johnson, have been honored on stamps, though none of them were communicants of any orthodox church; further the statements of many of them indicate a rather low opinion of orthodoxy. In fact it would be logical and historically accurate to regard most of them as free-thinkers.

The Postal Department has likewise honored several other freethinkers in addition to Masaryk and the above, prominent among whom is John Jay, an early Chief Justice of the United States, who "hopes the day will come when the idea of establishing any kind of religious institution by force will pass away," and Noah Webster, friend of the crossword

puzzle mob, who expresses an opinion somewhat similar to Lincoln's in regard to the "book of books," thus: "Many passages in the Bible are expressed in language which decency forbids to be repeated." Benjamin Franklin said: "The way to see by faith is to shut the eye of reason," for which he was honored with a stamp, as also was our wonderful French friend Lafayette, who has left us this opinion: "If the liberties of the American People are ever destroyed, they will fall by the hands of the Catholic clergy." The Postal Department also remembered Thomas Edison, who, when asked what God meant to him, replied, "Not a damned thing," and religion he declared a "fake."

Then the Postal Department really did smash all conventions by honoring a woman; further it showed rare judgment in selecting Elizabeth Cady Stanton, to whom the women of the United States owe a debt of eternal gratitude. In evaluating individual contributions to human freedom, Mrs. Stanton ranks with Thomas Paine and Voltaire, something, I fear, not fully appreciated by the women of the twentieth century who make up the majority of the voters and are owners of the major portion of the country's property. They little realize that previous to Mrs. Stanton's "wild

tirades" women were not even second-rate citizens. They were, legally, mere personal property. There were, to be sure, certain laws for their protection, e.g., the size of stick with which their husband could beat them was limited to the thickness of his thumb. They were governed largely by the regulations of Saint Paul and Martin Luther and were not allowed to take the "sacramental cup in their own impure hands." In the nineteenth century some theologians conceded that woman had a soul though the Catholic Encyclopedia still maintains that it is inferior to the soul of the male of the species, which doctrine was infallibly endorsed by Popes Pius XI and XII. Mrs. Stanton, though forced to accept orthodoxy, as are most Christians in their defenseless youth, later kicked these restrictions into the scrap heap. But let her tell it—"The Bible and the Church have been the greatest stumbling blocks in the way of women's emancipation." "The whole tone of Church teaching in regard to woman is, to the last degree, contemptuous and degrading." "I found nothing grand in the history of the Jews nor in the morals inculcated in the Pentateuch. I know of no other books that so fully teach the subjection and degradation of women." "The religious superstitions of women perpetuate their



bondage more than all other adverse influences." "How can any woman believe that a loving and merciful God would, in one breath, command Eve to multiply and replenish the earth, and in the next, pronounce a curse on her maternity? I do not believe that God inspired the Mosaic code, or gave out the laws about women which he is accused of doing." "The Bible contains some of the most sublime passages in English literature, but is also full of contradictions, inconsistencies, and absurdities. The memory of my own sufferings has prevented me from ever shadowing any soul with the superstitions of the Christian religion." "Out of the doctrine of original sin grew the crimes and miseries of asceticism, celibacy and witchcraft; woman becoming the helpless victim of all these delusions." "The more I read the more keenly I feel the importance of convincing women that the Hebrew mythology has no special claim to a higher origin than that of the Greeks, being far less attractive in style and less refined in sentiment." "If God did talk to Moses, such a character (The Jehovah of the Bible) is not worth our love and worship. If he did not, the Bible is not worthy of our faith and confidence." "To no form of religion is woman indebted for one impulse of freedom, as all alike have taught her

inferiority and subjection." "The Christian church has throughout the ages used its influence in opposition to the freedom of woman." "All the men of the Old Testament were polygamists, and Christ and Paul, the central figures of the New Testament, were celibates, and condemned marriage by both precept and example." "Throughout this protracted and disgraceful assault on American womanhood the clergy baptized each new insult and act of injustice in the name of the Christian religion, and uniformly asked God's blessing on proceedings that would have put to shame an assembly of Hottentots." "The real difficulty in woman's case is that the whole foundation of the Christian religion rests on her temptation and man's fall." "Through theological superstitions woman finds her most grievous bondage." "Our system of theology is based on woman's degradation." "In Europe during the dark Christian centuries, humanity touched the lowest depths ever reached by civilized man." All of these seething and spicy opinions of the lauded cult were held by one of America's foremost and most valued women, and about the only one the Postal Department has found worthy of a commemorative stamp.

A check of the commemorative

stamps issued by the United States Postal Department would lead one to conclude that the past few Postmasters General were Atheists, taking advantage of their positions to honor America's free-thinkers. Should not Congress

authorize the issuance of a stamp bearing the faces of Postmasters General Farley and Summerfield in commemoration of their foresight and generosity in honoring the above mentioned leaders for human freedom?



## Principles or Reprisals

EDWARD H. REDMAN

**D**REW PEARSON reported recently in his column that the activities of the National Association of Evangelicals during the presidential campaign were under review by the Internal Revenue Service. The regulations pertaining to the tax exemption of religious bodies were cited, and it was pointed out that any penalty imposed on this Association and others would apply only to 1960.

This whole matter raises serious questions, and I find myself compelled to rise to the partial defense of these Evangelicals, although I am satisfied that the Internal Revenue Service might be viewed as derelict in its duty if it did not proceed to act in this matter under

the present law. This focuses the issue on the law itself, which, in my opinion, violates the spirit of the First Amendment.

What is the substance of the First Amendment? It is best to put the text before us, since the matter will come up repeatedly:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Yet here we already have a problem—what is the spirit of the First Amendment? The only recourse for resolving such ques-



tions, when laws seem to be in conflict with the Constitution, is a decision of the Supreme Court. There has to be a case. Sometimes the Court finds ways to settle a case on minor points without touching the greater issues. Of late the Court has had a new doctrine, "Balancing" it is called, so that the absolute guarantees of the Bill of Rights become relative to the expedient needs of the nation, and this is certainly a distressing drift of the times. Often the Court sets forth a majority opinion, and one or more minority opinions, and this gives us guidance as to what can be expected for awhile until some new case and some new distribution of opinion changes the interpretation but, of course, it does not stop the debate.

The issue of the moment is whether or not religious organizations should be denied their tax exemption if they "participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office." Section 501 (c) (3) Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

It is to be noted that this denial is unqualified. (I use the word denial here loosely to mean that exemption is not to be granted, and so far as this case is concerned to mean that an existing exemption is likely to be suspended.)

So I say this denial of exemption does not allow for occasional deviations. One statement, or act of intervention, during *any* campaign on behalf of *any* candidate, is enough! It is a curious circumstance that this provision, amending the earlier law, was passed in 1954 on the motion of Senator Johnson of Texas. I, personally, thought it was wrong at the time. I still think it is wrong but it is now the law.

Earlier provisions regarding exemption of certain kinds of institutions from taxation made a distinction between the relative amount of attention given to political considerations as opposed to the on-going fundamental work of the institution. In the case of educational, charitable, or religious organizations, no substantial part of their activities could be in carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation. This seems, in retrospect, a more wholesome provision. It is moderate. It is in keeping with fundamental realities.

In any real life situation it is obvious that there are emotional and motivating factors. I have read with care the pamphlet distributed by the *National Association of Evangelicals* which Mr. Pearson mentioned: "A Roman Catholic President: how free from church control?" There may be other pieces of literature which

have a more extreme force and give conceivably more offense. There may have been unusually large donations from persons of great wealth to facilitate distribution of these pamphlets, under circumstances which would let the donor participate in the dimension of political influence in such a way that much of his donation could be at the government's expense. There has been much newspaper comment along these lines, and it cannot be ignored. But for the moment I want to discuss the pamphlet in question. While it was evidently used quite widely during the campaign, it was not issued explicitly in behalf of any candidate, nor was it, in its substance, immoderately or conclusively, setting forth a position against any candidate. The farthest the pamphlet goes in its most forthright paragraphs is as follows:

The big question is: would Mr. Kennedy or any other Catholic President do what he says he will do or would he yield to the pressure of the hierarchy in Rome when the chips are down?

In the light of the official position of the Catholic Church, the historical developments of the Roman Catholic Church's participation in politics, the present situations abroad, the statements of the Catholic Press

in America, the application of Catholic political action in America, and Mr. Kennedy's own action in two exemplary cases, there is strong indication that no Catholic President would be as free as Mr. Kennedy claims he would be.

Now these are sturdy paragraphs, and they do leave a high degree of doubt in the mind of the reader as to what may be expected from Mr. Kennedy, but it is unfair to take them out of context. They summarize several pages of carefully prepared testimony from sound sources. The ground of concern has been soberly delineated, carefully documented, and expressed with commendable objectivity. This is no ordinary piece of hate literature. We can disagree with its outcome. We can argue that it stresses one dimension without sufficient attention to other dimensions, but we must be mindful of its substance, and admiring of its positive merit, recognize that it could just as easily have been a Unitarian sermon, an article from the *Unitarian Register*, as a product of the Evangelicals. In certain paragraphs it expresses our feelings about political action as well as I have ever seen it expressed!

The Protestant Church must also face the question of its position on this important issue. Because it is so easy to get



emotionally aroused on this subject, the church must be careful to maintain its equilibrium. We dare not get involved in politics in a way that would violate the very principles we are trying to protect. While the church is responsible for informing her people concerning such issues, she must not try to dictate what their political action should be. This must be left to the individual Christian using the freedom that is his as a Protestant and an American.

I am concerned about the Internal Revenue Code, at this point, and on this point, because, by the very tradition of our movement the right—even the obligation—of our ministers to work for, to associate themselves with, to write and to speak in behalf of, social and political causes as individual citizens is a matter of common expectation. Many of our churches write this expectation in their preliminary statements as they seek new ministers. This adds up to a considerable, if not substantial, subsidy of community leadership. It is also the case, as a matter of tradition amongst us, that the religious implications of pending matters before legislative bodies shall be discussed from the pulpit, not thereby to bind the church as a church to a course of action, but certainly to set forth, as effectively as pos-

sible, the minister's opinion as to the way things should be, from an ethical, moral, and religious point of view, and thereby to influence somewhat the outcome, especially if the substance of his remarks is thereafter mimeographed for wider attention or if it is reported in the public press.

I am sure that our expectation does not stop at this point. There will be candidates and Party Platforms about which something is to be said from the pulpit, as a matter of principle, in accordance with the common practice of ministers and congregations from the days of the prophets of Israel, if not long before that, even until now. This is the very essence of religion, inescapably and unavoidably, and if perchance our lips were sealed by an arbitrary action of the State, let us face it squarely, we would do as our co-religionists behind the iron curtain must do, as Christians and Jews alike under Nazidom were disposed to do, as plantation slaves had to do, as early Christians in the days of the Persecution had to do, speak in myths and symbols whose surface meanings might be bland enough, but whose real force and intent would be unmistakable within the ranks of the faithful. It cannot be otherwise. Politics is the practical side of religion. A concept of the good life, of modes of social reform, of the ideal state to be

achieved, must find its political expression. Parties, and partisans, laboring for realization of religious ideals, will inevitably find sympathetic support from the ranks of church people, and for every religious position there is a corresponding political ideal. This may or may not bear any correspondence to formal affiliation and professed beliefs, to be sure, so that one cannot argue with any assurance that a Catholic will in consequence stand for such and such political views. It may be that the true religion of a man shines forth in what he has done politically with far greater clarity and meaningfulness than his formal commitments. And so it is, too, with all others: Protestants, liberals, fundamentalists, or Jews, whether orthodox, conservative, or reformed.

Perhaps we should reexamine the tax situation from a different point of view. So far we have talked about this matter of loss of exemption as if it marked the infringement of a right, and I have been defending the right of religious bodies to intervene in the political process. I fear that something would be done to initiative and the active expression of religious concerns if ministers, laymen, and church bodies were to fail to express themselves out of fear of some penalty being imposed, a penalty, for example,

such as the denial of tax exemption. But there is a bolder position. If, as a matter of fact, all religious bodies sought no such exemption, then the whole problem would take a different turn.

I have noticed in the records of the Michigan Area Unitarian Conference in the 1880s there were formal resolutions passed to the effect that churches ought not to go on accepting exemption from ordinary property taxes.

Goods and services are furnished by the local community, the state, and to some extent by the national government, which represent real expenditures for the well-being of the church. If the church, as a property owner, does not pay its share, non-churchgoers as well as churchgoers must pick up these costs, which may be somewhat inequitable. At the same time a church, in accepting exemption from property taxes, may be in the position of choosing not to do some things as a church that it might otherwise choose to do, and this constitutes a limitation, of sorts, on its freedom. By and large, in not accepting federal income tax exemption, churches would suffer no hardship except with reference to endowment or investment income. It is true, however, that provisions in favor of donors to churches would be in need of reworking. It seems to me that benefits to



donors could still be provided if, as usual, their total gifts to all charitable purposes did not exceed a reasonable percent, or if the gift was earmarked to the capital funds of a church. There might be a provision, however, that large and unusual gifts even to churches, for political purposes, could not be deductible. I think, by the same token, religious organizations entering intensively upon a campaign of political action ought to incorporate an organization for this purpose, separate and apart from the existing organization for the fulfillment of ordinary purposes, and let its status be the same, so far as taxes are concerned, as any other association, the primary purpose of which is to lobby, to influence legislation, to pamphleteer, and/or to intervene in the political process.

As I reflect on this further, I come back to the realization that seldom if ever does a religious group enter the field of political action for the sake of political action. Generally its political purposes are, again, an extension of its religious purposes. Take our Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice as an example. A letter writer whose opinions found their way into the *Unitarian Register* wants us to disassociate ourselves as Unitarians from its activities, and urges that the Fellowship

itself give up the word Unitarian from its name! This is an expression of one man's opinion, on religious grounds, for political inaction, and I know he does not stand alone by any means. But the Fellowship itself would stand for nothing, would be nothing, would mean nothing, could do nothing, if its whole purpose and existence did not arise from the desire of some Unitarians to have this means of religious expression through political action.

Exemption of religious institutions from taxation clouds the separation of church and state, of this I am certain, and it paves the way for arguments in favor of subsidization, by the state, of religious institutions such as parochial schools or, perish the thought, the direct subsidization of religious services. At least this is the force of an Indiana Court decision in 1853, as cited by Leo Pfeffer in his book on *Church, State, and Freedom*, but there is only the tiniest chance of turning back the customs and traditions of centuries in this regard. This being the situation, for better or for worse, and I think mostly for the worse, if we cannot terminate the practice of granting tax exemption to the churches, we can only insist and demand that all modes of religious expression be benefited without discrimination.

It was for this reason that I endeavored to secure support for our churches in California two years ago for bringing their case before the Supreme Court. Exemption from property taxes was being denied to those churches which refused to sign an affidavit attesting the loyalty of their members to the State Constitution. Not only could this amount to a kind of religious test, discrimination between those to be benefited and those not to be benefited by the state, but also it afforded an example of what might be done in a state favorable to segregation, to discriminate against churches unwilling to profess loyalty to such provisions in State Constitutions.

I also have in mind the plight of the Washington Ethical Society, a few years back, as well as the plight of the Fellowship of Humanity in California. What constitutes a religious society? What are the limits of religious concern and expression? The Washington Ethicals were denied tax exemption because in the judgment of the Tax Court of the District of Columbia they did not require "a belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation." The Fellowship of Humanity had deeper problems, for it was thoroughly engaged not merely in exercises and expres-

sions of a humanist religion, but more or less radical political beliefs as well. On review both organizations regained their status.

But let us not soon forget that they were put in jeopardy and that they found it necessary to fight to regain status. A public authority could presume to be so bold as to declare under what circumstances a religious society may qualify as a religious society! This would constitute an attempt to perceive an establishment of religion, to put boundaries and limits of what shall be recognized as legally acceptable belief. Of course we cannot take an absolute stand, at this point, or ask that any religious group be granted the privilege of doing anything whatsoever that comes to mind without any let or hindrance. There are certain limits. We no longer grant to the Mormons the privilege of plural marriage. We insist that the children of sectarians attend schools offering a minimum amount of secular instruction. We require vaccination regardless of religious scruples. We apply safety standards to religious edifices, and so on. By and large, these limitations have been imposed to uphold the public interest, to protect the interests of children, and otherwise to look after the common defense and the general welfare of the people.



To some extent restraints have been imposed in relation to the needs of children that could not, up to this point, have been imposed in relation to adult cultists.

Keeping in mind these limitations on the absolute freedom of sectarians to act against the general interest, we must ask if engagement in the political process is in any sense such an action. Clearly no one could seriously think it inappropriate for the members of any society to function as individual citizens. Clearly no one could seriously suppose that any association of people, gathered for whatever purpose, should or even could be prevented from identifying the relevance of any party's or candidate's proposals to the interests and values of the group as a group. Having identified the area of concern, to enter the political process to let the concern be known, to aid the cause of those representing the group's values and impede the cause of those in opposition to the group's values naturally follows. That a church can and will in one way or another be political, overtly or covertly, directly or by

implication, is a fundamental fact of life.

A law which ignores this fact, and applies punishments and penalties to a religious body exercising a political function, tends to be discriminatory.

The state may need to have some partial control to cover the possibility that religious bodies may be used as means to strictly political ends, by persons whose aims, motivations, and generosity were political and not religious. But there is danger in the separation of the sheep from the goats. If we are to be guided more by principle than by the impulse toward reprisal, we must hold that the greater interest lies in safeguarding freedom of expression, rather than being troubled by its occasional flagrant misuse.

Thus the question returns to the problem of the present law. I think that the Revenue Service must take an action or be derelict in its duty, but until such time as all religious institutions are no longer tax exempt, I fail to see how the law can be held constitutional. I hope to see at the very least a modification of the law.



# If This Be Heresy

MAX D. GAEBLER

**D**URING the past year the *Christian Century* magazine ran a series of statements by leading churchmen on the general theme: How my mind has changed during the last ten years. The final article in this series of autobiographical sketches was produced by Bishop James A. Pike, the well-known leader of the Episcopal churches in California. An ex-Roman Catholic and ex-lawyer, Bishop Pike has been one of the Protestant church's most forthright and effective spokesmen. In this candid statement on how his own mind had changed during the decade of the fifties he has stirred up the proverbial hornets' nest—no novelty for this salty and controversial Bishop.

A few quotations will make abundantly clear why his article has occasioned so much comment both within his own church and outside it. In the opening paragraph he casually comments that he does "not find reason to accept the historical virgin birth." This sounds far from radical to Unitarians, yet it is startling—to say the least—when it comes from a Bishop of the Episcopal Church! But this was only the beginning. "My earlier neo-orthodox orientation," he goes on to say, "... I

now find entirely too 'vertical.' My theology is still completely 'grace-centered,' rather than works-centered. . . . But I no longer regard grace, or the work of the Holy Spirit, as limited explicitly to the Christian revelation. . . . Truth is truth wherever it is found, and all truth is God's truth." He makes this even more explicit: "I am unable to accept my old verticality because my experience in the ministry—and as a person—has convinced me that there is much truth and goodness in natural man. . . . The kind of god I first believed in, who would limit salvation to a select group of people, . . . is an impossible god."

Even the doctrine of the Trinity—or at least its familiar formulation—is felled by the Bishop's sweeping blows. This doctrine, he says, was "probably the best the philosophers of the early church could do to try to preserve the monotheism of God as against the natural tendency toward polytheism in that day. . . . [They] did their best. But what they did does not speak to me now." Going on to the Apostle's Creed, which is repeated in every service, Bishop Pike strikes another body blow to religion



that is merely conventional. The creed is essentially a part of the liturgy, as he sees it, and liturgy has as its main function the mythological reinterpretation of religious tradition. There are many statements in the creed, he avers, which are sheer nonsense when taken literally. Thus to speak of Jesus as "born of a virgin" and as "ascended into heaven" where he "sitteth at the right hand of God" is to speak allegorically or mythologically and not literally. For this reason Bishop Pike says he much prefers that the creed be not recited but sung, so that the mode of expression makes clear its poetic and mythological character.

Perhaps the ultimate blow to ecclesiastical stuffiness comes with his straightforward assertion: "I have preached more and more in the past decade on the values of atheism and agnosticism. Atheists debunk the small god. . . . There has to be a large measure of agnosticism in true religion: as to most questions people ask about religion, the only answer is 'I don't know.'"

With this resumé of Bishop Pike's statement, incomplete as it is, it becomes obvious why so many readers of the *Christian Century* should have felt impelled to respond. One Lutheran pastor located the heart of his disagreement with Pike: "His concep-

tion of God," he wrote in a letter to the editor, "... has evolved ... within the limited confines of his own mind as being palatable to his reason. Therefore he has confined God to the prison of his own rational powers, ignoring the fact that the mind and ways of God are 'past finding out' and only palatable to faith, not reason. My reason would make me want to agree with Bishop Pike, yet I cannot." So clear and candid a rejection of reason is hard to come by. A Roman Catholic priest replied in similar vein, speaking of the pain Bishop Pike's position must cause his fellow churchmen. "How upsetting it must be," he wrote, "to find one of their own bishops advocating the recitation, or rather singing, of a creed many of whose articles he does not accept." And then, as if to demolish Pike's position by showing that it is really nothing new but simply a recurrence of ancient heresies, the priest concludes that it "is just plain old-fashioned Arianism and Nestorianism disguised in high-class language." Which, being interpreted, is a polite way of saying that Bishop Pike sounds almost like a Unitarian.

Not all the letters to the editor of the *Christian Century*, however, were critical of Bishop Pike. One Missouri minister, who now serves a community church, de-

scribed his own similar spiritual pilgrimage. Starting as a fervent fundamentalist at Bob Jones University in South Carolina, this man had become a minister in the Southern Baptist church until he could no longer conscientiously remain there. He wrote: "Though some will say that his (and my own) changing of affiliation and ideas is merely switching labels on an empty bottle, it is an almost unavoidable process followed by many who insist on pursuing truth wherever it may lead, and who have to live with themselves."

I have not followed the reactions within Bishop Pike's own denomination, but I suspect he has found both pained critics and ardent supporters. The one thing which has come to my attention was contained in an Associated Press dispatch from San Francisco dated January 30. According to this story, a number of Episcopal clergymen in South Georgia complained in a letter to their Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Albert R. Stuart of Savannah. They accused Bishop Pike—and with some justice, as the quotations from his article which I cited above make clear—of expressing disbelief in "the virgin birth of our lord, the doctrine of the holy trinity as stated by the church and the necessity of salvation through Jesus Christ alone."

Bishop Pike, however, is not

one to take such criticism quietly. "I'm not much of a heresy hunter," he told a news conference, "but if they bring a heresy charge against me at the house of bishops meeting next fall, I might file a counterclaim." He said the basis of any such charge by him would be segregation as practised in Episcopal churches in the South. "Now there," he added, "is a heresy worth discussing."

It may be a bit indelicate for a Unitarian to comment on the internal arguments within another denomination. Yet the controversy stirred by Bishop Pike's article is so pointed and it has already been carried so far beyond the confines of his own fellowship that I make bold to venture two or three observations of my own.

The first concerns the relationship between reason and religious faith. The issue was posed in the clearest possible terms by the Lutheran pastor whose response to Bishop Pike I quoted. "My reason," he said, "would make me want to agree with Bishop Pike, yet I cannot." And the reason he cannot is because "the mind and ways of God are . . . only palatable to faith, not reason." For this gentleman, faith apparently means what the old Southern preacher suggested when he said, "faith is believin' what you know ain't so." In other words, the religious man or woman



accepts as true propositions which his own mind rejects. It is the acceptance of propositions in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. It is, in short, the rejection of rational thinking in favor of blind credulity. When religion comes to this, it can scarcely be regarded as anything but destructive of the best in man, the instrument of man's dehumanization.

There is nothing new in the assertion of this Lutheran pastor, nor is there anything new in Bishop Pike's contrary insistence that "truth is truth wherever it may be found." More than a century ago William Ellery Channing, the father of American Unitarianism, pointed to the terrible dangers which attend the rejection of reason in religion. "I am surer," he said, "that my rational nature is from God than that any book is an expression of his will. This light in my own breast is his primary revelation, and all subsequent ones must accord with it. . . . Never, never do violence to your rational nature. He who in any case admits doctrines which contradict reason has broken down the great barrier between truth and falsehood, and lays open his mind to every delusion. The great mark of error, which is inconsistency, ceases to shock him. He has violated the first law of the intellect, and must

pay the fearful penalty."

How fearful that penalty can be we have had awesome opportunity to observe in our own time. The forces of unreason have led man to mass murder on a scale and with a callousness without precedent; those forces of unreason have induced men to contradict their own positions without warning out of loyalty to a party which played upon their idealism while serving the ancient ends of imperialism, a party whose line has changed so often and so radically that none could predict it safely—not even its own followers; these same forces of unreason cause men even today to vent the bitterness of their prejudices on little children seeking only to exercise their legal and moral right to enter a public school. Murder, exploitation, discrimination—these are the fruits of unreason. And if in the name of religion the claims of reason are rejected, the way is opened not only for the faith of the pious, but for every form of fanaticism and bigotry as well. Fearful indeed is the penalty when we permit the claims of reason to be undermined, for then truly is "the great barrier between truth and falsehood," of which Channing spoke, obliterated and the minds of men opened "to every delusion."

My second observation arises out of the comment of the Mis-

souri minister which I quoted earlier. He wrote, you will recall, of what he called "the almost unavoidable process followed by many who insist on pursuing truth wherever it may lead, and who have to live with themselves." It is this matter of living with oneself that interests me. What he is talking about is the same thing the founders of our Madison Unitarian Society had in mind when they stated, in our Bond of Union, that the "first aim" of this Society was to be "integrity of life." To say one believes what one does not in fact believe, to continue using forms which one has in one's own conscience rejected, to pretend to attitudes which are not genuine—these are practices which shake the very foundation of moral responsibility. Yet many people, in the name of religion, do exactly these things. Anyone who takes seriously the problem of living with himself will insist that religion is nothing if it does not demand utter honesty of spirit and mind. The Lutheran pastor I have already quoted to the effect that his mind would lead him to agree with Bishop Pike but he nevertheless cannot do so—this man is patently honest, and we must respect his honesty even though we reject his position.

But consider Bishop Pike's own position at this point. He frankly

rejects many elements in the creed as literal statements. Because he regards them as essentially mythological, he prefers that they be sung rather than recited, since in singing we are at once sensitive to our own involvement in a form of artistic expression. We can surely agree that much of the language and imagery of religious tradition is mythological, that it speaks many profound truths through the medium of dramatic and symbolic words. And we can agree that to reject religious tradition out of hand because it is not literally true is to deprive ourselves of rich mines of insight and inspiration. Nevertheless, these symbolic meanings are also subject to scrutiny; and here the obligation to be honest with ourselves takes hold of us. It is not enough to say that the meaning of the creed is symbolic; we must also affirm that these symbolic meanings appeal to our reason and conscience as being true. If we cannot do this, then we are hypocrites if we continue to recite or even to sing the creed as if we believed its symbolic if not its literal meaning.

If "integrity of life" is to be the first aim of religion, as our Bond of Union puts it, then we must be free to accept or reject any elements in religious tradition as our own individual minds and consciences dictate. To have



an established and required creed at all is to place limits on this individual right and duty to be completely honest with oneself. For there is always the temptation to pretend to oneself that one has found truth in the prescribed statements even when to do so involves the most far-fetched and artificial interpretations. Thus, established creeds are inevitable begetters of hypocrisy, the subtle enemy of genuine integrity

of life and thought. How much happier to make that integrity itself the chief aim of religion, to regard tradition as the servant and not the master of the intellect, and to find the deepest fellowship with those who share with us not answers to life's ultimate questions but the unending search for meaning. This is the quest upon which we who call ourselves religious liberals are embarked.

---

**Editorial Comments**  
(Continued from page 4)

The committee found that "the public image of the ADC family and the ADC program in Cook County is almost entirely false." The investigation revealed these facts about ADC recipients:

1. "They are not newcomers; 90% have lived in the State for five years or more. . . ."

2. "Those from outside the State did not come to Illinois to get assistance, but to take a job, to be with their husbands, or to join relatives."

3. "The principal reasons for ADC dependency are desertion, separation, divorce, unmarried parenthood, incapacity, physical or emotional ill health, and death. Racial discrimination in employment is one of the most serious direct and indirect causes!"

4. "The mothers do not rush to apply for ADC, but instead use

all possible resources first and apply for ADC as a last resort."

5. "Most families do not stay on ADC indefinitely."

6. "The number of ADC mothers who neglect their responsibilities is negligible."

7. "ADC families do not have additional children to get larger relief allowances. The more children, the more the family is in debt."

If all of this is true in the allegedly wicked Chicago, certainly in the so-called "better" communities the welfare programs should be a real boon to the community and a sound method for keeping families together and for rehabilitation.

One should think twice before condemning any public assistance program. Get the facts so as to be helpful, not harmful, to those who have fallen upon days of misfortune.

# Ethics of Man

JOHN G. MACKINNON

**T**HE situations of tension and conflict in the world arise from what people do to achieve values, striving toward value systems which are different according to behavior norms and ethics which are different. How soon shall we be able to achieve an "ethics of man"?

It is well to note that we already have a rudimentary ethics of man. In every culture there are laws and behavior norms which protect human life; which support some system of economic arrangements so that people may achieve the wherewithal to live; and which specify and control the relations between the sexes, so that propagation may take place in a manner conducive to the continuation of the community. These three values—life, sustenance, and propagation—are common human values. To secure them, all ethical systems enunciate certain basic directives.

Conflict arises not out of these basic values, but because each culture has developed peripheral values and systems of ethics built

upon this basic foundation. These are different. If we are to have an ethics of man we must realize that we cannot expect this to come about by the acceptance by all people of our ethical system in toto. We must be able to distinguish between behavior norms which are essential to life itself and those which serve to perpetuate our way of life. Intercommunication might serve to develop a basic ethics of man, with wide latitude for cultural variations, if it had time enough. The threat of nuclear war cuts short the time available.

Perhaps the first step is to labor for a system of enforceable world law which would concern itself only with the guarantee of that most basic of all values—that we all want to go on living. At any rate the time has come when survival is no longer guaranteed by unswerving loyalty to one's own culture and ethics, but only by the vision of, and a growing commitment to, a larger and more inclusive culture—the ethics of man.



# The Issues Are Real!

ELLSWORTH M. SMITH

**B**Y THE time this article sees print the Western Unitarian Conference will be one hundred-nine-years-old. It has been a good organization. It has encouraged fellowship and freedom among Unitarians in the north central part of the country (though in its early days it received reports from churches as far away as Syracuse, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans). It has served Unitarians and Unitarian societies without dominating them. It has never pretended to be a governing body.

Its pattern of regional operation was an encouragement in the establishment of eight other Unitarian Regions by other groups of churches. Everywhere in Unitarianism in the Regional organizations and activities there is spontaneity, creativity, freedom, and responsibility. The "institutional" burden has been light. The joy of getting together and doing wonderful things in a wonderful spirit has characterized all the activities of all the Regions. The churches create, control, and make thorough use of their Regional organizations.

Time after time throughout Western Conference history, while it was the only substantial Region,

we have resisted and *have had* to resist the efforts of national leaders and the national Unitarian organization to control and to dominate and to make uniform our free Unitarian expression. **AND NOW WE MUST DO IT AGAIN!**

At Syracuse we rushed through the adoption of organizational details of a new, merged denomination. The blue pencil was seldom used. We "went along" with an innocent-sounding statement that the new Association would *maintain* Regions, not worrying for the moment about financial maintenance being a means for control. We did not even notice that while every other level of Unitarian expression, from the local pulpit to the Continental office, was explicitly guaranteed autonomy and freedom, Regions were explicitly not mentioned. I was told that Regions would be taken into a *higher level* of denominational organization and that autonomy would not be a problem.

Now we have the Report of Committee Four on Regions. It provides for no Regions at all, as we Western Conference people know the term. Both candidates for the Presidency have publicly

admitted this fact. The Committee recommends that we organize our new Unitarian Universalist denomination by Districts of forty to sixty societies with a man and his secretary serving each. For the time being most of these District offices would be on a part-time basis. The District Director would be chosen by the societies in the District. His budget would be okayed, provided, and probably supervised by the Allocations Committee at Continental Headquarters. The present Unitarian Appeal budget committee has been telling us for several years: "You can't have this program, you can't have that item, you can't have that amount" and presumably this procedure would not be relaxed in a period of tightened Continental control.

Committee Four would further provide for from four to seven Service Centers, each of which would relate to two to four Districts. A Service Center would be an office with an Associate Director and his secretary, which would channel and schedule the local field work of Continental staff people to the churches and fellowships of its Districts. The Service Center man would be appointed and established and have his duties assigned by Continental Headquarters. He would have an Advisory Council provided by the Districts under him, but he will

not be responsible to that Council, but rather to Boston. Dr. Greeley has said that the Service Centers will be Continental Headquarters spread across the continent. The Center's budget will be determined and provided by Headquarters. Continental Headquarters has 100 plus employees to serve a denomination of 100,000 plus members.

It is not intended that the District Directors would go to Boston at intervals or have other occasions for meeting together. The Service Center men would go to Boston for staff meetings.

The District Directors would have no normal way to meet to recommend changes or to make a protest, if, in our democratic movement, changes were resisted or an effective protest needed.

A no - protest organizational structure does not produce, encourage, or protect democracy.

Financial control of every level of denominational organization above the parish will be in the hands of a Headquarters Committee on Allocations, responsible to the Continental Board. What will this new plan mean in terms of actual control? During the past four years, the United Appeal has refused to "allow" Western Conference new program items i.e., R. E. field work and fund raising, year after year, with the result that in order to introduce new



programs the Conference has spent \$75,000 of capital funds. No other Region could do that. Our greatly increased program has been accomplished in spite of the opposition of the relatively "neutral" United Appeal. It has paid off. There is a greatly increased participation in the Western Conference in denominational activities, and we are now second or third on the list of Regions in per capita support of the Appeal instead of eighth.

Committee Three has now reported. In effect it tells us we should all sing a new doxology because all financial blessings will flow from Continental Headquarters. It would appear that all denominational fund raising will originate there and all allocations for above-the-parish-level activities will be made there, by a Committee of the Front Office. Even Catholic Dioceses have more freedom of initiative than this. No other Protestant denomination has such a controlled system as this, nor would any Protestant denomination tolerate it. We ought to become, and it will have to be in a hurry, at least as good protesters as are the Protestants!

Of course we are urged to trust the good will and the superior judgments of one Headquarters Committee for our financial destinies. But, the Washington expansion was refused help by

Headquarters and the Washington story would not have happened except by the assertion of independence in the Washington area. Headquarters is NOT Unitarianism, but the SERVANT of Unitarianism.

Committee Three would have Headquarters enlist and charge laymen in all the societies up to one-tenth of the membership of each society to work constantly under Continental direction to secure denominational support funds for Headquarters to allocate across the continent and to use for itself. One denominational fund raiser for every ten members of every Unitarian and Universalist society. Read the report—it is in the book!

One devoted Unitarian said to me: "What are we to be—a Unitarian Methodist church?" (The Methodists are more democratic.) Another said: "These new structures could be the organizational manual for the Armed Forces."

#### Corollaries

1. There would be no denominational organization above the parish level with more than a one-man-one-girl potential and most of these would be, for some years, a part-time-man-one-girl operation.

2. There would be absolute control by appointment of personnel and allocation of funds of the

Regional level Service Centers.

3. There would be no Unitarian Universalist organization above the parish level but which would be under the absolute control—through money—of the Continental Headquarters office.

4. Continental control would be staff-exercised and we would become a staff-dominated denomination.

5. The control of the present Unitarian Regions would be taken away from the churches and fellowships and invested in the Continental Headquarters staff.

6. There would be no Regions—just branch offices of Headquarters.

7. The control of the present Universalist State Conventions would be taken away from the churches and invested in the Continental Headquarters staff—through divesting the Conventions of their own control of their own funds wherever legally feasible.

8. There would be no agencies or organizations above the parish level with any reason to hold funds. There have been several hints to the Western Conference that we should begin to talk about ways of handing over our funds to Continental Headquarters.

#### Continental Headquarters

The new Unitarian Universalist Association will be governed by a delegate body intended to meet

once every year or every two years. Those who go to May Meetings know that what gets on the agenda is determined by the Business Committee. Nothing like our present Regions will have the right of petition (see the Green Book). Every time we get together at May Meetings we are a "new" body of delegates, meeting only once in a lifetime as such, and with precious little time to "go into" things.

Between General Assembly Meetings the Board will govern. The Board will normally meet three times a year. The Board has such a press of business that several present members have expressed extreme frustration at being unable to really know what they are doing.

Between Board Meetings the Executive Committee will govern. It will be made up of nine members. Five will be a quorum and with only a quorum present three can carry a vote. (The President does not vote, but will be the only member of the Committee who gets around and knows the churches.) In many cases the Executive Committee makes primary decisions.

Ask any lawyer how much chance grass roots democracy will have through such a structure for either initiative, dissent, or control!

It was determined by the Con-



stitution adopted at Syracuse that the Regions (as we know them) would not have the right of petition. Now, Committee Four provides that there be no Regions !

#### More about Headquarters

We have been talking about Headquarters in the administrative, governmental sense. But there is another Headquarters.

Headquarters is also a number of service agencies and departments. They are doing a good job for all of us. They are manned by competent people. It is a joy for a Secretary of a Region to cooperate with them on common problems. We Regional men depend on *this* Headquarters for many utterly necessary services.

Some of the Department staff heads at Boston have told the Regional men that no matter how many skilled field staff people they have, they cannot serve local societies adequately when these societies need help critically and when they have emergencies. They say, and have said, that the Regions must hire skilled people or train skilled volunteers, to render services to local societies when and as needed, to supplement the Continental staff. We have been working at this. We have fourteen trained volunteer religious education field people and we pay their expenses for

extended local field visits. We have a Fellowships Chairman in each of our eight Area Councils and have appropriated funds to pay for their travel. And we have a staff person for Fellowships.

The new denominational plan would not envisage this. All special and skilled services will come from Continental Headquarters. Only "generalists" will be built into the District and Service Center offices.

#### How Did We Get into This Situation?

1. Unitarianism has tried twice before to strengthen itself and to produce growth through extending Continental Headquarters energy and impact to branch offices across the continent. It failed both times.

2. Two attempts to start a layman's fellowship movement were tried and failed. In both cases Continental Headquarters attempted to be helpful by prescribing program content and by requiring reporting of each meeting.

3. The Joint Merger Commission was given the task of suggesting a new regional pattern of organization. The Commission called in the Regional Directors and the Universalist State Superintendents for consultation. Our testimony was that new Regions should be built through on-the-

field negotiation between the Boards of existing autonomous Regions and Conventions. The Merger Commission did not consult the Boards of Regions or Conventions. The Commission came up with a recommendation that the new Association, the Continental body, "establish and maintain" Regions. This was altered at Syracuse to read "maintain" Regions.

4. The Regions and the State Conventions, through their governing Boards, have never been consulted about the new pattern of Committee Four.

5. The Western Unitarian Conference Board has had no answers from the Board of the American Unitarian Association to its communications over the past four years.

6. The American Unitarian Association has worked with the existing Unitarian Regions for many years but did not get around to acknowledging their official status until two years ago.

7. President Frederick M. Eliot, in his early days, eagerly supported the development of Regions. In his latter days he expressed the fear that the Regions could use their freedom to frustrate the AUA.

8. President Dana M. Greeley has spoken for three years of "the problem of the Regions" but he has never explicitly stated one

problem and has agreed that the existing Regions have cooperated fully and have worked hard at denominational support.

9. The Regional Directors are unanimously glad to be officially responsible to the Continental Association and spend a good half of their time doing the work of the Association.

10. Committee Four, we were assured, would "of course" consult with the Regions and the State Conventions. It could not and has not. Seven Listening-Post hearings were held and hundreds of Unitarians and Universalists came to these hearings and offered their best thought about the kind of Regional organization the new denomination ought to have. Five results should be noted:

a. There was nearly unanimous agreement that Regions should be autonomous and could well be different in size, in function, and size of staff.

b. There was much testimony to the value of "small" Regions, such as our sub-regional Area Councils. The main organizational thrust of the Western Conference in the last ten years has been to encourage the growth, the initiative, the prime-mover responsibility of our Area Councils toward the time when they can have paid staff. In our budget for 1961-62 is \$10,000 to put



at the disposal of Area Councils in this growing emphasis.

c. Much of the testimony for small regions also stated that if a Region wanted to be large it should of course have the right to be large. Much of the testimony for small Regions was in favor of small and strong sub-regions within large and strong Regions.

d. These hearings were held last fall. But months earlier, July, 1960, Dr. Greeley met with the Regional Directors (I was absent) and urged a plan for regionalism which is exactly what Committee Four has now recommended. The other Regional Directors told me of this and said they thought we would have to go along with this pressure.

e. Dr. Greeley, as candidate for President, backs the recommendations of Committee Four which would have, at the level we call Regional, Headquarters branches. Dr. Rice, as candidate, recommends that the Service Centers have actual supervising Boards of Directors. Both have agreed that there is no issue between them as to denominational fund raising and allocation.

11. The Unitarian Regions and the Universalist State Conventions are autonomous organizations. Most of them are incorporated. Their churches created them and legally control them.

Only they can vote to conform to the new pattern or to go out of business so that the new pattern can be put into effect. Yet the General Assembly is going to vote on whether they should conform or go out of business and thus will create, without consultation, a tremendous presumptive force over the future of the Regions and Conventions. This is obviously and utterly unfair.

12. Governing Headquarters says the churches are *their* churches. The Regions and State Conventions say the churches are *their* member societies *also*. Committee Four thinks it cannot be both ways, at least not at significant levels. Why not? All Unitarian and Universalist organizations are service organizations. None are significantly governing organizations unless we vote these new plans.

### My Faith

Someone said, and I wish I had thought of it first: "Is it not a shame that we have to take time out to work to defeat unworthy proposals such as these?" I think they are unworthy of a free people. They would sound passing strange, were they understood, to the Unitarians and Universalists I know. They could not have come from the Unitarians and Universalists I know—only from an official Committee more than